

- 2) At 11:30, the meeting resumed with Mr. Jones, City Librarian, giving an explanation of what had happened to date.
- 3) I asked President Lane to resign since she had said that if the Mayor didn't fulfill his pledge to the Library of a "100% budget," that is what she would do. She denied saying it at some length. This was picked up by Channel 2.
- 4) I accused Bradley of a double-cross and a breach of faith. This wasn't picked up on TV, but KNX radio and KFWB carried it.

The Commission voted to send the Mayor a letter stating that it could not approve the recommended cuts because the Library only got 2% of the entire City budget, anyway; because people use libraries more in high unemployment periods; and, because it did not want to add to unemployment.

The Administration sent the unapproved cuts to the Mayor anyway.

Again, it was the Guild's action that precluded the Commission's approval.

The AFSCME Office has been instructed to reinstitute the Unfair Labor Practices Charge, if necessary.

More Guild Style Magic--Council Budget Hearings, Monday, May 12

The Council did not approve the Finance Committee's recommended \$89,000 cuts in a 6 to 7 vote.

Voting not to cut: FERRARO, LORENZEN, SNYDER, WILKINSON, GIBSON, WACHS.

Voting for the cut: FARRELL, RUSSELL, NOWELL, LINDSAY, CUNNINGHAM, BRAUDE, and BERNARDI.

It was close, folks, and the Guild did it through its work with the Council. When asked what the cuts meant prior to the vote, Jones made no statement justifying maintenance; his statement almost justified the cuts because he did not say how we would be hurt. Bindery--the big one--doesn't really mean anything to someone not connected with libraries. If it's explained that such a cut is false economy since it reduces the potential use of books, it becomes clear that we're not getting maximum use from our initial investment.

Ferraro made a fine statement about not cutting those who don't give the City any trouble but who, in fact, are performing well as evidenced by the almost 185,000 increase in circulation compared to last year.

We had seen Ferraro's deputy. She was very receptive to what the Library has been doing. Wach's deputy also assured us of his vote. We also picked up Wilkinson, Lorenzen and Gibson. The visits to Braude, Cunningham and Russell didn't pay off. Braude's position is obvious. As Chairperson of the Finance Committee he's pro cuts. Cunningham thinks libraries aren't necessities and Russell is strictly the Mayor's girl.

The question through all of this as asked by a growing number of Councilmen is why do we have such a gutless City Librarian?

In June the Guild held a picnic at Ferndell in Griffith Park. Doris Dosser, Tony Shay, and Joyce Elliott came in full garden party regalia and dined off crystal, silver and china. "Maid" Leslie Wiseman (Nordby), appropriately dressed, served the chilled gazpacho and Strawberries Romanoff. The elegant picnickers graciously had their "maid" offer champagne to nearby members scarfing up hot dogs and potato chips off paper plates!

On November 6, an "earthquake" hit LAPL when the administrative transfer of five regional librarians was announced at an adult order meeting. The affected principal librarians were informed of the transfers just prior to the meeting.

MANAGEMENT RIGHTS, NO!

MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES, SÍ!

By Jane Ellison, President, Librarians' Guild

The administrative transfer of five regional librarians was announced by Marilyn Tamura, Director of Branches, at the November 6, 1975, order meeting. The announcement was a shock to everyone, but particularly to the five people being transferred.

She announced that: Nina Wilson will move from East to West Valley; Joyce Elliott from Hollywood to East Valley; Betty Purdy from Central to Hollywood; Charlotte Jackson from Southern to Central; and lastly, Rhyllis Weisjohn from Northeast to Southern, leaving Northeast vacant.

This move, a first of its kind, is supposed to be effective December 1, 1975. The five regional librarians, all Guild members, unanimously decided to fight the administrative transfer.

They met with Tamura on Thursday, November 13, 1975, to get her thinking and reasoning about the transfer. I was not at that meeting but was told that her answers were nonspecific and therefore not satisfactory. The general drift of her response was that the transfer had been long contemplated by the "administrative team", that the West Valley vacancy created the chance to make the transfer, and that it was "for the good of the Library."

I had called Edith Bishop on November 10, 1975, requesting a meeting of the Ad Hoc committee provided in Article 23, Employee Relations, in both rank and file and supervisory contracts. This joint union/management committee "... shall be established for the purpose of discussing any major policy matters or potential employee problems, affecting the relationship between the parties."

Bishop answered later the same day that administration would prefer an informal meeting, to which I agreed; the meeting was to be called for November 14, 1975, at 10 a.m.

At 9 a.m., on the day the joint meeting was scheduled, I met with the five regionals to discuss what they wanted to do and how to best do it. They agreed they wanted to fight the transfer but wanted to hear more from the administration before their decision was final. We further agreed that Nina Wilson was to be the spokesperson, that the meeting was to last one hour, until 11 a.m., and that we would have a 1/2 hour evaluation session following the meeting to see if anything was changed as a result of the meeting.

The working outline Nina used had four points:

1. Basis for the decision to transfer;
2. The decision itself: the policy that permits it;
3. Effect of the decision;
4. Responsibility for the decision ... among other concerns, talking about reasons for the decision with other staff but not with the affected librarians.

The meeting was attended by Jones, Bishop and Tamura and lasted one hour. Barbara Clark, as a very concerned regional librarian, also attended.

I served as Union Representative and note-taker. Joyce Elliott took comprehensive notes, included below. From the notes I took, I "distilled" 18 reasons for the transfer, the bulk of which were offered by Jones and Tamura. They are:

1. The administrative transfer (A.T.) is good for the library.
2. The A.T. suits the talents, weaknesses, and strengths of the individual regions.
3. The A.T. was made to give promotional considerations to each regional librarian, in that it will broaden her background. The A.T. was made now because there will be two administrative openings within the next two years.
4. Department of Parks and Recreation regularly makes A.T.'s.
5. A.T.'s are a management right.
6. The A.T. will expose the regionals to new situations.
7. There will be five new supervisors to train in West Valley; an experienced hand is needed.
8. The "administrative team" has talked about the A.T. for a long time.
9. The regionals represent the entire branch system.
10. The regionals can't assume they have a right to a position indefinitely.

11. It's essential that there be changes.
12. Consideration was given to the personal effects of the A.T. (though none of the five regionals was consulted as to how she would be affected). Mrs. Bishop made the offer during the November 14 meeting to meet with each regional individually to consider her reasons individually. The offer was turned down since the regionals had all decided that meetings were no longer in their best interest.
13. The A.T. was part of the Library Commission's goals; i.e., staff rotation heralded a "new season of change".
14. The A.T. was part of affirmative action; i.e., it would broaden the regionals' experiences and make them more promotable.
15. The A.T. would give the regionals the chance to work with other branch librarians.
16. All of the regionals have made A.T's themselves.
17. The A.T. was part of an opportunity for growth and development.
18. The regionals (and department heads) shouldn't continue doing what they're doing in exactly the same way.

During this exchange, Bishop and Tamura conceded the announcement could have been handled better, but excused the maladroitness of the action because they wanted to make the change right away with no break (in operations).

Joyce Elliott's transcript:

"For your information, this is a re-phrasing of a meeting between the Regional Librarians and Administration represented by Mr. Jones, Mrs. Bishop, and Mrs. Tamura. The subject was the mass re-assignment of the Regional Librarians. Nina Wilson was our spokeswoman.

Jones: Reasons for mass reassignment; to try to fit Regionals to Regions; broaden experience for promotion.

Wilson: We are not satisfied with the reasons - where is this policy written down? We have never had transfers handled like this before.

Jones: Not intended to be punitive.

Wilson: Why is West Valley Region more important than Northeast Region which is being left vacant?

Tamura: I never said that.

Wilson: Stories are circulating about 3 Regionals: that there are punitive reasons for transfers.

Bishop & Jones: No disciplinary actions were intended.

Tamura: Regionals represent the entire city on committees & need broader experience.

Elliott: Don't Dept. Heads need broader experience?

- Bishop: With a new Division Librarian, no changes will take place at Central right now.
- Wilson: Many people recently made a decision to seek promotion or not by taking the Division Librarian Exam.
- Bishop: No one has the right to a position indefinitely.
- Purdy: People choose areas where they can perform well & feel comfortable..
- Bishop: Management doesn't know these reasons.
- Wilson: There was no consideration of personal, emotional, or professional consequences..
- Bishop: You can't read our minds.
- Elliott: This will create an upheaval throughout the system..
- Wilson: There was no discussion before or after; but individuals have been given other information, privately.
- Jones: New Board has different goals; Affirmative Action; Policy of Rotation.
- Bishop: Would a different method of presentation have made a difference?
- Jackson: It was so impersonal, dehumanizing.
- Elliott: I feel we are not in control of our destiny.
- Purdy: Morale has been destroyed.
- (There was a discussion of the impact professionally-long term projects aborted; time to learn new region, etc.)
- Bishop: The West Valley vacancy forced action. We have considered this for a long time.
- Jones: Rotation came up in staff dialogues.
- Wilson: We ask for reconsideration of the transfers.
- Jones: I am willing to discuss this with Mrs. Bishop & Mrs. Tamura.
- Clarke: May I expect the same treatment after 5 years at Mobile Services?
- Bishop: You would be consulted before a transfer. Mrs. Tamura and I would like to meet individually with the Regional Librarians.
- Wilson: That is unacceptable.
- Jones: You may expect a decision in several days.

On Tuesday, Nov. 18, Nina Wilson as our spokeswoman, will ask Mr. Jones for his answer. At 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, the Regional Librarians will meet in the staff lunchroom to consider further actions as necessitated by the answer. Any Principal Librarian who is interested, is invited to join us."

Nina asked for reconsideration of the action in that none of the answers were satisfactory. Jones said they would reconsider, and when Nina asked when, he said within several days.

At the 11 a.m. follow up meeting, the regionals decided to:

1. Go ahead with their grievance;
2. Talk with other Principals to keep posted;
3. See how the department heads could support them;
4. Ask Jones for his decision Tuesday morning, November 18, and demand it by that afternoon, if he didn't announce it earlier. (He said "no change" on November 17.)
5. Meet at 4 p.m., November 18, with Jones' decision and the information I had from our grievance representatives and our attorney. Invite interested department heads to the meeting.

Joyce Elliott agreed to type up and circulate her notes to all principals at Central, so that they could decide what they wanted to do on the basis of the meeting.

When we got together on November 18, I suggested that we request immediate arbitration to have a decision before December 1, 1975 (effective date of transfers). This possibility was discussed with Mel Reich, Hirsch Adell's new partner. The letter below was sent to Jones; Gene Kidder, head of the C.A.O.'s Employee Relations Division; and to Bert Glennon, City Attorney's office.

"November 19, 1975

Mr. Wyman Jones, City Librarian

Re: Administrative transfer of five (5) regional librarians, effective 12/1/75.

Dear Mr. Jones,

I respectfully request that you concur with us in immediately proceeding to arbitration on the grievance placed by the 5 affected librarians for the following reasons:

1--On Friday, 11/14/75, we informally discussed the transfer with you, Marilyn Tamura and Edith Bishop. We heard your reasons for the transfer and indicated to you that we were not satisfied. We, therefore, requested you to consider withdrawing the transfer.

2--On Monday, 11/17/75, you announced that you would go ahead with the transfer.

3--We assume your 11/17/75 response is final. It would appear useless to go through steps 2 and 3 of the grievance procedure, particularly since the supervisory level at step 2 -- Marilyn Tamura -- and at step 3 -- yourself -- were parties to the 11/17/75 decision not to withdraw the transfer.

4--One of the five affected librarians would have to travel approximately 20 miles more each day, adding approximately 1 hour travel

time each day. This action on your part would constitute a constructive discharge. The Skelly decision requires that a preliminary hearing be given before any such action can take place. The transfer constitutes a material change in the conditions of employment for each of the employees. A hearing is necessary before an employee's job rights can be so drastically affected.

We ask you to delay implementation of the transfer until such time as the matter can be heard by an arbitrator.

Please respond immediately.

Thank you,
Sincerely,

Jane Ellison, President"

We further agreed upon the citations to be used in the grievance: M.O.U. Articles 5 and 19. Article 5: "Non-Discrimination"; the entire article applies, but there is special emphasis on the second paragraph; "In accordance with this policy, management agrees that no employee shall be interfered with, intimidated, restrained, coerced or discriminated against because of the exercise of his (sic) rights granted pursuant to Section 4.857 of the Employee Relations Ordinance."

"Sec. 4.857. EMPLOYEE RIGHTS.

Employees of the City shall have the right to form, join, and participate in the activities of employee organizations of their own choosing pursuant to the provisions of this chapter for the purpose of representation on matters of employee relations, other than those excluded herein. City employees also shall have the right to refuse to join or participate in the activities of employee organizations and shall have the right to represent themselves individually in their employment relations with the City. No employee shall be interfered with, intimidated, restrained, coerced or discriminated against because of his exercise of these rights."

Article 19 - "Intra Departmental Reassignment Opportunities" states, "The assignment of employees within the Library Department, is the exclusive right of the appointing authority such reassignment will be made with the aim of established optimum effectiveness within the department ... while recognizing the needs, abilities and preferences of individual employees."

Two important arguments grow out of Article 19: 1) hardship felt by the affected librarians --- professional, personal, emotional, financial, and 2) "past practice".

It was decided that the best role for the department heads to play at this point was to submit a support statement. It was drawn up and language checked by our attorney.

"TO: Wyman Jones, City Librarian

Support Petition for the Grievance of Five
Regional Librarians re Administrative Transfers

We, the undersigned Principal Librarians, support the grievance of the five Regional Librarians subjected to administrative transfers, effective December 1, 1975. We believe that these transfers were made without recognizing the needs, abilities, and preferences of the individual employees as required in Article 19 of the Memorandum of Understanding between the Board of Library Commissioners and the City Administrative Officer, and the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, September 3, 1975. We further believe that these transfers are in violation of Article 5 of that Memorandum, which bans discrimination against employees because of the exercise of rights granted in the Employee Relations Ordinance.

Signed:

Mariana K. Reith
Helene Mochedlover
Katherine E. Grant
Evelyn Greenwald
John Bruckman
Robert Mayer
Irene Hagen
Bill Speed (Audio-
Visual Supervisor)

Riva T. Bresler
Mary Pratt
Barbara Jacobs
Robert J. Brown
Melvin Rosenberg
Marilyn C. Wherley
Ruby M. Hori."

The last statement was a short letter of support by Barbara Clark, quoted below. She and Penny Carr were the two untransferred regionals. Penny will submit a separate letter of support, enunciating her particular concerns.

"November 19, 1975

Mr. Wyman Jones, City Librarian

Re: Administrative transfer of five (5) regional librarians, effective 12/1/75.

Dear Mr. Jones,

I support the grievance placed by my colleagues.

Sincerely,

Barbara Clark
Principal Librarian"

The letter requesting immediate arbitration, the support petition and support letter were hand delivered by me to Mr. Jones' secretary at 4:15 p.m., November 20, 1975. (Mr. Jones had gone for the day.) The five identical grievances were hand delivered by me to Mrs. Tamura at 4:10 p.m., November 20, 1975.

Mel Reich, the Guild's attorney, will speak with Glennon (City Attorney's office), November 24, 1975, to work out arbitration or court injunction.

The morals of this story:

1. Management is anxious to protect its "Rights". It isn't as eager to live up to its responsibilities.
2. It takes more than a sense of outrage to protect our rights; it takes collective planning, decision making and determination.
3. Once an action is decided upon, additional careful planning is required; our grievance representatives and attorneys were constantly advising us ... one reason we are a union.
4. Once an action is agreed to, everyone stays with the decision until the "bitter end" ... where, often, the end turns out to be pretty sweet.
5. A strong M.O.U. or contract that protects our rights is of paramount importance. We wouldn't need it if we had a management that acted in "GOOD FAITH". We worked our brains out to get Article 19 included in this year's contract.
6. Know your contract -- and that means everyone. Don't depend on me or the Executive Board or your stewards to take care of you.

Only you know when your rights have been violated. Guild officers and stewards will inform you of what actions are necessary, what the choices are, how to proceed; we will support and work with you, but it is a two-way relationship.

The regional librarians, to a person, understood what was involved. They made a scary decision ... challenging one's boss is never easy. The regionals are to be admired and supported for their action. It was an honor for me to work with them.

Recommendations for other support

The Northeast Regional position was listed as open on the November 17, 1975 "Principal Librarian - Regular" certification. The last day to report was November 21, 1975. Please DECLINE the interview. If you have accepted, call back and decline.

The senior librarians on the principal list can support their colleagues by this action. Other principal librarians considering transfer can support the regionals by calling Personnel to say they won't consider transfer until after the matter is resolved.

Your stewards will keep you informed on the progress of this most important grievance.

Don't identify with management. Management doesn't identify with you.

1976: In mid-January the Luckman report, "Feasibility Study Report for the Development of a New Central Library, City of Los Angeles", was released. Staff study committees began in-depth examinations of what should be in the new building. We were one tiny step closer to a new Central Library.

In February, the arbitration hearing on the administrative transfer of five regional librarians began. The tiny hearing room was crowded with librarians using their days off to show their support.

Management presented a weak and contradictory case. First they denied there was a vacancy, then they admitted there was a vacancy when the Guild located a copy of a Personnel memo dated October 23, 1975 which announced the vacancy.

There was a second arbitration hearing over the administrative transfer of Joan Lysaught. The protagonists were the same as in the principal librarians' arbitration: Michael Berman for the Union vs. Coley Knight for the City.

On April 16, Arbitrator Edward Peters ruled in favor of the five regional librarians who had been arbitrarily transferred. (The Union also won in the Lysaught arbitration.) Unfortunately, without binding arbitration, it was up to the Board of Library Commissioners to make the final determination, and they upheld management's position.

Among the many librarians gathered in the hallway to await the Board's decision was Helene Mochedlover. Helene was accosted by her supervisor, Loyce Pleasants, and asked to explain her presence. The supervisor suggested that Helene return to her department, and Helene was later disciplined for not obeying instantly. Helene's grievance went to arbitration and again Coley Knight faced Michael Berman in a court-like proceeding. Unfortunately, this time the bad guys won.

As for the administrative transfer dispute, Marilyn Tamura (Johnson) then did what she should have done in the beginning. She called each regional librarian in for a consultation about the transfers. The upshot was that two of the five returned to their original positions, two remained in the new positions, and one moved to a third region. The incident was over except for the residual distrust and hurt feelings.

May brought a refreshing interlude as Guild members assembled in Big Bear for a retreat with Shirley Zimmerman as facilitator. Shirley was trained in Saul Alinsky techniques and showed Guild members better ways to deal with management. The weekend ended with a new set of priorities for supporting each other and confounding management.

In July the Board of Library Commissioners decreed Sunday service. It was to be just another work day, everyone would participate, and there would be no extra monetary compensation. The staff's reaction was predictable: NO!